

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE: DERRICK ANDREW HINES,  
d/b/a UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
THE UNITED STATES, THE STATE OF  
MICHIGAN, THE CITY OF ROYAL OAK,  
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Case No. 18-mc-50562

IN THE MATTER OF:  
SOCIAL SECURITY  
COMMISSIONER NANCY BERRYHILL  
STATE OF MICHIGAN 44<sup>th</sup> DISTRICT COURT  
ROYAL OAK POLICE DEPARTMENT  
CITY OF ROYAL OAK  
CITY OF REDFORD  
ALL AMERICAN BOND AGENCY,

HON. AVERN COHN

INSOLENT DEBTORS/IMMIGRANTS(s) SUBJECTS,  
\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

I.

Derrick Andrew Hines, Thomas proceeding pro se, has filed a paper styled "Government Notice of Removal Change of Venue." The Clerk's Office assigned the paper a miscellaneous case number. For the reasons that follow, the case will be dismissed as frivolous.

II.

"[A] district court may, at any time, sua sponte dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12 (b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure when the allegations of a complaint are totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial, frivolous, devoid of merit, or no longer open to discussion." Apple v. Glenn, et al. 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999). When reviewing pro se papers, the court must employ standards less

stringent than if the complaint had been drafted by counsel. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).

III.

The Court has read Hine's paper. It is virtually unintelligible. As best as can be gleaned, Hines seeks to step into the shoes of the state and federal government, including the "Bureau of Consumer Financial Affairs" and "remove" "traffic and other alleged matters" that are pending in the 44<sup>th</sup> District Court. Hines references federal statutes, such as the Fair Credit Reporting Act, "immigration laws," "bankruptcy laws," and "criminal laws."

First, to the extent plaintiff seeks to relitigate any events that have occurred in the 44<sup>th</sup> District Court, the complaint is barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. Under this doctrine, lower federal courts lack jurisdiction to review a case litigated and decided in state court. District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482 & n.16 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923). This is true even in the face of allegations that "the state court's action was unconstitutional." Feldman, 460 U.S. at 486, 103 S. Ct. at 1317; see also Blanton v. United States, 94 F.3d 227, 233-34 (6th Cir. 1996).

Overall, after reviewing Hines' paper, the Court cannot discern a viable or plausible claim or a basis for "removal" of any case to federal court. Accordingly, the case is DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/26/2018  
Detroit, Michigan

S/Avern Cohn  
AVERN COHN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE